

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/807,190	04/10/2001	Katsuya Matsuda	MATSUDA 13	4190
1444	7590 02/27/2004		EXAM	INER
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300			GOLLAMUDI, SHARMILA S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			1616	· ·

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A 12 42					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
· Office Astion Commence	09/807,190	MATSUDA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Sharmila S. Gollamudi	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet with t	the correspondence address				
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETURN THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by set Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	ONR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3) eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS statute, cause the application to become ABANI	be timely filed 0) days will be considered timely. 5 from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	20 November 2003.					
	(a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.					
,	,					
closed in accordance with the practice und	der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 29-52 is/are pending in the application	cation.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	ndrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>29-52</u> is/are rejected.		•				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	reign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority docur	ments have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority docur		lication No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the						
application from the International B						
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified copies not re	ceived.				
,		_				
Attachment(s)	,	·				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sun	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S	5) Notice of Info	rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	•				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of Amendments filed and Rule 132 Declaration received on November 20, 2003 is acknowledged. Claims 29-52 are pending in this application. Claims 1-28 stand cancelled.

Response to Amendment

The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed November 20, 2003 is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 29-52 based upon Holmes-Farley et al (US patent 6,083,495).

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 29-30 and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Holmes-Farley et al (6,423,754).

Holmes-Farley et al disclose the method of preparing crosslinked phosphatebinding polymers in oral formulations for the treatment of hypercholesterolemia. See abstract and column 3, lines 35-50. The polymers are prepared by combining polyallylamine hydrochloride, acetonitrile, and epichlorohydrin, yielding particles in a Art Unit: 1616

solution. The solid particles are then dried in a vacuum oven and passed thorough a 50-mesh screen (approximately 300 microns). See examples on column 6, lines 15-45.

*Although the prior art does not teach the instant specific gravity and properties, it is the examiner's position that these are inherent in Holmes-Farley since applicant clearly states on page 10 of Applicant's Remarks that the instant phosphate-binding polymers have the instant specific gravity due to the specific preparation utilizing a solvent mixture of water and acetonitrile and crosslinking polyallyamine with epichlorohydrin.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1616

Claims 31-32, 36, 41-43, 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes-Farley et al (6,423,754).

Holmes-Farley et al disclose the method of preparing crosslinked phosphate-binding polymers in oral formulations for the treatment of hypercholesterolemia. See abstract and column 3, lines 35-50. Suitable forms for administration are tablets, capsules, or powders. Further, the polymer may be administered alone or in combination with a carrier. See column 3, lines 35-60. The polymers are prepared by combining polyallylamine hydrochloride, acetonitrile, and epichlorohydrin, yielding particles in a solution. The solid particles are then dried and passed thorough a 50-mesh screen (approximately 300 microns). See examples on column 6, lines 15-45.

Holmes-Farley et al does not exemplify the tablet formulation.

It is deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to look to the guidance provided by Holmes-Farley et al and utilize a tablet formulation containing the phosphate-binding polymer. One would be motivated to do so with the expectation of similar results since the prior art clearly teaches that the tablets are suitable form for administering the instant polymers. Therefore, one would be motivated to utilize the dosage form of choice depending on the desired type of administration.

Claims 33-40 and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes-Farley et al (6,423,754) in view of Sato et al (5,202,335).

Holmes-Farley et al disclose the method of preparing crosslinked phosphatebinding polymers in oral formulations for the treatment of hypercholesterolemia. See

Art Unit: 1616

abstract and column 3, lines 35-50. Suitable forms for administration are tablets, capsules, or powders. The polymer may be administered alone or in combination with a carrier such as magnesium carbonate, lactose, etc and can be coated to protect the composition from disintegration. See column 3, lines 35-60. The polymers are prepared by combining polyallylamine hydrochloride, acetonitrile, and epichlorohydrin, yielding particles in a solution. The solid particles are then dried and passed thorough a 50mesh screen (approximately 300 microns). See examples on column 6, lines 15-45.

Holmes-Farley does not specify the instant excipients: crystalline cellulose or HPC.

Sato et al teach succinic compounds for oral administration. Sato teaches that in molding pharmaceutical compositions into tablet formulations, many conventional carriers known in the art may be used. These carriers include lactose, sucrose, microcrystalline cellulose, etc. Sato also teaches the use of conventional disintegrators such as low-substituted HPC. The tablets may be coated with a sugar coating, gelatin coating, enteric coating, and film coating, depending on the desired effect. See column 8, lines 54-68. Sato teaches various suitable excipients for the composition that are known in the art. See column 9, lines 1-16.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Holmes-Farley et al and Sato et al. One would be motivated to do so since Sato teaches that instant tablet coat and instantly claimed excipients are conventional in the tabletting art. Further, Sato teaches the functional equivalency of Holmes-Farley's suggested lactose carrier and instant

Art Unit: 1616

microcrystalline cellulose. Therefore, one would be motivated to substitute one carrier with another with a reasonable expectation of similar result. Additionally, skilled artisan would be motivated to coat the tablet depending on the desired effect of the composition, i.e. a sugar coat for a palatable tablet or a film coat for a smooth, glossy appearance.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharmila S. Gollamudi whose telephone number is 571-242-0614. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:00) with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SSG In CH MICHAEL G. HARTLEY PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 6

Art Unit: 1616

February 19, 2004

Page 7